

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed August 19, 2008. In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 5-12, and 14-24 were pending and rejected. With this Amendment, which is being filed with a Request for Continued Examination and three-month extension of time (under separate paper), Applicants have canceled claims 5-7, 10-12, 15, 17-19, and 22-24; amended claims 1, 8, 9, 12, 14, 21, and 24; and added new claims 26-35.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 14 to specifically recite subsumption. Applicants respectfully note that the subject matter of subsumption was previously set forth in dependent claims 7 and 19, which are now canceled. Further, that subject matter was rejected in Section Seven of the Office Action as allegedly being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,584,464 (Warthen) in view of U.S. Patent Publ. 2004/0199498 to Kapur et al. (hereinafter “Kapur”) in view of U.S. Patent Publ. 2004/0260677 to Malpani et al. (hereinafter “Malpani”) in view of U.S. Patent 6,493,721 to Getchius et al. (hereinafter “Getchius”). With respect to the subsumption subject matter, the Office Action, in Section Seven, refers to column 24, lines 7-22 of Getchius. Applicants respectfully note that column 24, lines 9-13 of Getchius provide, “Subsumption is generally the derivation of query results from previous results, which can be either a superset of the requested result or subsets of the requested result.” Thus, Applicants respectfully believe that while the word subsumption is provided in the Getchius reference, that the actual operation is vastly different than the subsumption set forth in Applicants’ amended claims. To highlight this distinction, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 14 to recite that the subsumption operation identifies a single word difference between a pair of help query strings. Applicants respectfully believe that subsumption in this form, which is supported by Applicants’ specification on page 13, lines 10-17, is neither taught nor suggested by Getchius. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2, 8, 9, 16, 20, 21, and 26-35 are allowable as well by virtue of their dependency, either directly or indirectly, from allowable amended independent claims 1 and 14.

With this Amendment, dependent claims 9 and 21 are amended to specifically recite multiple subsumption operations to each string. Applicants respectfully submit that

support for this limitation can be found, at least, on page 14, lines 15-17 of Applicants' specification.

With this Amendment, new claims 26-35 are added. Dependent claims 26-30 add further features to amended independent claim 1 while dependent claims 31-35 add similar features to amended independent claim 14. Applicants respectfully submit that these new claims do not present new matter and that such new claims are supported by the specification based upon the following. New dependent claims 26 and 31 are supported, at least, one page 13, lines 10-21. New dependent claims 27 and 32 are supported, at least, one page 13, lines 22-27. New dependent claims 28 and 33 are supported, at least, one page 15, lines 20-24. New dependent claims 29 and 34 are supported, at least, one page 15, lines 25 – page 16, line 3. New dependent claims 30 and 35 are supported, at least, one page 16, lines 3-11.

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully submit that the entire application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By:

Christopher R. Christenson, Reg. No. 42,413  
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319  
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

CRC:lah